REMARKS

Claims 2-8 and 14-20 remain in this application. Claims 1 and 9-13 are now canceled. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

The comments provided in section 15 on page 9 of the Office Action are noted with appreciation. Claims 8 and 17 are rewritten above in independent form and should be in allowable condition. Claim 19 is also rewritten above and is now in independent form. Prior art was not applied against claim 19, and claim 19 above should be allowable. Claim 18, which depends on claim 8, and claim 20, which depends on claim 19, should be allowable as well.

The objection to the drawings is moot in view of the specification amendments above, by which reference number 170 is eliminated from the specification.

To comply with the requirements set forth in sections 8-9 on page 4 of the Office Action, a new abstract is supplied, and the title is amended above.

Independent claim 1, dependent claim 2, and various other claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over international PCT publication WO 02/055207 to Samways in view of any one of four secondary references. Claim 2 is amended above to incorporate limitations previously appearing in now-canceled claim 1. Reconsideration of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is requested.

As the Examiner notes on page 8 of the Office Action, the Samways apparatus does not disclose a collection impeller with vanes extending along a helical path. The comments provided in the paragraphs spanning pages 8-9 of the Office Action are noted, but it is respectfully submitted that none of the four secondary references cited suggests the modification to the Samways apparatus proposed. U.S. Patent 1,277,676 to Wright, for example, describes a conveyer *e*, while U.S. Patent 6,533,713 to Borgstrom et al. describes an entraining device 14, and U.S. Patents 3,231,182 and 3,235,174, both to Downey, describe screw blades 79, 81 and 83. Each of these devices is a screw-type conveyor, which transports material along an axial or longitudinal direction. In contrast, claim 2 above recites "at least one collection impeller vane," thereby distinguishing the invention claimed from screw conveyors. During operation, impellers pressurize

a fluid by transporting it radially outward. This cannot be done with a screw transporter. In addition, as shown in Figure 5 of the present application, multiple impeller blades can be disposed around the longitudinal axis of the rotating shaft. This, too, is impossible with the screw transporter of the cited references, due to the shape of the screws.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the references describes or suggests using an impeller, because the transporter screws used in those references are used only to transport the material *axially*, without imparting a radial movement.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 2 as it appears above is patentable for reasons discussed. Dependent claims 3-7 and 14-16 should also be patentable. All claims remaining in this application, therefore, should now be patentable.

This application is now considered to be in allowable condition for reasons discussed. If there are any questions regarding this Reply or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an extension of time sufficient to effect a timely response. Please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket # 037141.55741US).

Respectfully submitted,

July 9, 2009

Richard R. Diefendorf
Registration No. 32,390

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
RRD:rd